“Privacy is even more necessary as a safeguard of freedom in the relationships between individuals and groups. As Alan Westin has pointed out, **surveillance and publicity are powerful instruments of social control.** 8 If individuals know that their actions and dispositions are constantly being observed, commented on and criticized, they find it much harder to do anything that deviates from accepted social behavior. There does not even have to be an explicit threat of retaliation. "Visibility itself provides a powerful method of enforcing norms." 9 Most people are afraid to stand apart, to be different, if it means being subject to piercing scrutiny. **The "deliberate penetration of the individual's protective shell, his psychological armor, would leave him naked to ridicule and shame and would put him under the control of those who know his secrets**." 10 **Under these circumstances they find it better simply to conform. This is the situation characterized in George Orwell's 1984 where the pervasive surveillance of "Big Brother" was enough to keep most citizens under rigid control**.” (<http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/focusareas/technology/internet/privacy/why-care-about-privacy.html>)

**It is because I agree with Computer Science Professor Michael McFarland that I negate today’s resolution. I will prove that the United States should *not* prioritize the pursuit of national security over the digital privacy of its citizens.**

**To clarify the round, I would like to define the following terms:**

**National security objectives is defined by the free dictionary as -** **The art** and science **of** developing, applying, and **coordinating the instruments of national power** (diplomatic, economic, military, and informational) **to achieve objectives that contribute to national security.** (freedictionary.com)

**Digital privacy is defined by Google as -** **a** trending **social concern**[1] subsequent to the 2013 mass surveillance disclosures which cast a shadow **over the privacy of cloud storage and social media. While it is concerned with the privacy of digital information in general, it many contexts it specifically references information concerning personal identity shared over public networks.**

**~~Prioritize is defined by Dictionary.com as “to organize or deal with something according to its priority.~~**

**~~The implication of this definition is that the world of the negative doesn’t completely sacrifice national security, but rather reframes the pursuit of national security to ensure digital privacy is respected~~.**

**Ought is defined by Dictionary.com as expressing a moral obligation.**

**Given that ought is the evaluative term in the resolution, the resolution expresses a judgment about our moral obligations. Thus, we are asked by the resolution itself to evaluate the prioritization of national security versus digital privacy from the perspective of morality. Therefore, I value morality.**

**The best criterion for determining our moral obligation is resisting structural violence.**

**Structural violence refers to physical, psychological, and economic violence inflicted upon socially vulnerable groups through the use of oppressive laws, policies, and dominant norms. Resisting structural violence means reappropriating or dismantling the very social structures that continue to inflict and legitimize oppressive violence.**

**Susan Opotow ‘01** (“Chapter 8: Social Injustice” *Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century.* Christie, D.J., Wagner, R.V., & Winter D.A. (Eds). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall 2001. http://academic.marion.ohio-state.edu/dchristie/Peace%20Psychology%20Book.html)

“**Both structural and direct violence result from moral justifications and rationalizations**. **Morals are the norms, rights, entitlements, obligations, responsibilities, and duties that shape our sense of justice and guide our behavior with others** (Deutsch, 1985). **Morals operationalize our sense of justice by identifying what we owe to whom, whose needs, views, and well-being count, and whose do not. Our morals apply to people we value, which define who is inside our** scope of justice (or **“moral community”**), such as family members, friends, compatriots, and coreligionists (Deutsch, 1974, 1985; Opotow, 1990; Staub, 1989). **We extend considerations of fairness to them, share community resources with them, and make sacrifices for them that foster their well- being** (Opotow, 1987, 1993). **We see other kinds of people such as enemies or strangers outside our scope of justice**; **they are morally excluded**. Gender, ethnicity, religious identity, age, mental capacity, sexual orienta- tion, and political affiliation are some criteria used to define moral exclusion. **Excluded people can be hated and viewed as “vermin” or “plague” or they can be seen as expendable non-entities. In either case, disadvantage, hardship, and exploitation inflicted on them seems normal, acceptable, and** just—**as “the way things are” or the way they “ought to be.” Fairness and deserving seem irrelevant when applied to them and harm befalling them elicits neither remorse, outrage, nor demands for restitution; instead, harm inflicted on them can inspire celebration**.”

**The implication is that we have a fundamental moral obligation to resist structural violence because the existence of social structures that inflict such violence will function to inhibit our ability to satisfy any other moral obligation to others. This means that resisting structural violence must come before any other criterion for morality.**

**Observation 1:**

**The pursuit of national security objectives is always ongoing because our national security is always either being threatened or will potentially be threatened in the future. Thus, when we prioritize the pursuit of national security objectives over digital privacy we enable pervasive government surveillance of US citizens.**

**Contention 1 -  Digital Privacy must be prioritized to cultivate critical and empowered citizens**

**Subpoint A) Affirming creates citizens who are passive and uncritical political agents**

**Government surveillance is used to discipline citizens into subservient subjects**

**Fox ‘01** (Richard Fox “Someone to watch over us: Back to the panopticon?” *Criminal Justice*. 2001. Fox is a professor at Monash University, Melbourne, Australia)

“**The year** George **Orwell predicted** would be the one in which most of **the world would be living under a totalitarian rule** which enforced its malevolent power **by total surveillance of its citizens has long since passed.** But the technological capacity to do what he described has been attained, and the image of a modern state with agencies possessed of an armoury of surveillance devices to record the present and remember the past remains compelling. Recent events in Europe and the South Pacific show how easy it is for totalitarian forces to assume power. But even within more stable democratic frameworks, there seems to be a growing willingness to rely on mass surveillance as a means of exerting disciplinary authority under the panopticon principles of Bentham (Rule, 1973; Davies, 1992, 1996; Lyon, 1994; Shapiro, 1999). Though seemingly more consensual, more diffuse and thus more benign than the Orwellian prospect, **the existence of any large-scale panopticon- style surveillance must be recognized as creating a new power relationship between the watchers and the watched.** **The** latter **[watched] are now more obviously in a position of subordination and uncertainty** (Norris et al., 1998: 5–6): **Not only does it facilitate the power of the watchers over the watched by enabling swift intervention to displays of non-conformity but through the promotion of habituated anticipatory conformity**. . . . **Surveillance therefore involves not only being watched but watching over one’s self. Social control is** thus **being achieved by conditioning to conformity as well as by the deterrent effect of potential exposure**. More pointed inter-ventionist and exclusionary strategies through the criminal justice system, or other means, are still being kept in reserve, but the surveillance record strengthens them immeasurably by offering the evidence to justify such action if required. It is proper for criminologists to enquire what form the surveillance society is taking, but it is far too late for them to ask whether someone is watching over us: ‘Unnoticed by the public, and overlooked by social and political commentators, the surveillance society sneaked under our guard, and has been implemented’ (Clarke, 2000b: 14).”